

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 15, 20 and 25 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 14-18, 21, 23-24, 27-30, 33-34 and 37-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barnett et al. 2003/0118179, 'Barnett', hereinafter. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the amended claim 14, Barnett does not disclose a sheet shaped member covering at least front surfaces of the two housing portions.

The Office action states that Barnett teaches a sheet shaped member covering the bendable member and the two housing portions (e.g., see elastic sheet 30 is encased in elastic sheath 40 as illustrated in figure 5 and discussed in at least 0021). However, there is no disclosure in Barnett that the elastic sheath 40 (the alleged sheet shaped) covers at least the front surfaces of the two housing portions. The Office action also states in rejecting claim 15 that it covers the lower portion of the top half of the housing when inserted into slot 12. However, the elastic sheath 40 does not cover any portion of the front surfaces of the two housing portions, since the elastic sheath 40 merely covers the elastic sheet 30 and is inserted into the slot 12 which is formed only on the end surface of the housing. Barnett is silent that the slot 12 may be

formed on the front surface of the housing. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 14 is not taught by the reference, claim 14 is not fully anticipated by Barnett. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Similar arguments apply to claim 15.

Claims 16, 21, 23-24, 27-29, 33 and 37 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 14 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 14.

Claims 17, 18, 30, 34 and 38 which are dependent from any one of claim 15 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 20-22, 25-26, 31-32, 35-36 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Barnett et al. 2003/0118179, 'Barnett', hereinafter, in view of Holtorf et al. US Patent No.: 7,251,323, 'Holtorf', hereinafter. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claims 20 and 21, neither Barnett nor Holtorf, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable a sheet shaped member covering at least front surfaces of the two housing portions.

Barnett does not disclose the above feature, as discussed above regarding the 102(b) rejection against claim 14.

Holtorf is silent about the above feature, since Holtorf is merely cited for the use of the receiving antenna.

Accordingly, the combination of Barnett and Holtorf does not meet all of the limitations of claim 20 or 21. Therefore, the asserted combination of Barnett and Holtorf does not render claims 20 and 21 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claims 20 and 21 is respectfully requested.

Similar arguments apply to claim 25.

Claims 31, 35 and 39 which are dependent from claim 20 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 20.

Claim 22 which are dependent from claim 21 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 22.

Claims 26, 32, 36 and 40 which are dependent from claim 25 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 25.


In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/576,630
Amdt. Dated: September 8, 2010
Reply to Office action of June 9, 2010

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-40271.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: September 8, 2010